

Re: BQ UC Motion

From: "Miousse, Jerome" <jerome.miousse@pmo-cpm.gc.ca>
To: "Pickard-Tattrie, Seth" <seth.pickard-tattrie@justice.gc.ca>, "Williams, Caroline (Ext.)" <caroline.williams@qpc-cpr.gc.ca>, "Murdock, Kelly" <kelly.murdock@ps-sp.gc.ca>
Cc: "Jagric, Alex" <alex.jagric@pmo-cpm.gc.ca>
Date: Wed, 16 Feb 2022 19:12:51 +0000
Attachments: image003.png (7.75 kB); image003.png (7.75 kB)

Going forward with opposing

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 16, 2022, at 12:58, Miousse, Jerome <Jerome.Miousse@pmo-cpm.gc.ca> wrote:

BQ just gave us a heads-up that they will seek unanimous consent after QP today on the below motion. Initial thinking is we oppose given we've already explained our position on this – what are your thoughts?

That this House, like the unanimous motion of the National Assembly of Quebec:

- is concerned about the current disruptions in Ontario and around some federal border crossings;
- affirms that no emergency situation currently justifies the use of special legislative measures in Québec;
- asks the Canadian government not to apply the Emergency Measures Act on Québec territory;

and that this House reiterates the importance of close cooperation between the federal government and the Government of Québec, in particular to ensure the peace and security of the Outaouais citizens who are suffering the repercussions of the demonstrations under way in Ottawa and who could pay the price for any deterioration in the situation.

Jérôme Miousse
Cabinet du Premier ministre | Office of the Prime Minister
Enjeux et Affaires Parlementaires | Issues & Parliamentary Affairs
613-618-1696
[cid:image003.png@01D82334.E04528D0]